

REMARKS

Applicant's statement of substance of interview.

Applicants wish to express appreciation to Examiner Justin King for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to Applicants' representative Lenny Jiang (Reg. No. 52,432). A personal interview was conducted at the USPTO on February 7, 2006. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary, numbered Paper No. 20060207. During the interview, claims 11-18 were discussed vis-à-vis the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. As noted in the relevant part of the Examiner's Interview Summary, "[t]he carrier wave is not a statutory subject matter according to the [latest] USPTO guideline. It is recommended to amend the preamble to [overcome] the 101 rejection."

General remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 have been amended. New claims 19-21 have been added. Claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12-18 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 19-21 are now pending in the application. The rejections are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the amendments and remarks presented herein.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants request the Examiner to indicate that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received (by checking box (1.)) in the next Office communications.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1, 9 and 11 have been objected to because of alleged informalities. Applicants have amended claims 1, 9 and 11 to improve clarity. Support for the claim amendments is found in at least in FIGS. 1 and 2 of the specification (see steps S1-S9 as shown in FIG. 2) and on page 15, line 23 to page 16, line 3 (e.g., control function to enable the receiver R to utilize the audio information; and the receiver R is capable of the receiving process when the connection is established with the receiver R) and page 7, lines 8-17 (e.g., the status of one information processing apparatus for transmitting/receiving information to/from other information processing apparatuses). Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite a computer program embodied in a computer-readable medium, and is now believed to directed to statutory subject matter. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Iwamura

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Iwamura (U.S. Patent Number 5,883,621). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding amended claim 1, the claimed invention relates to:

A status notification apparatus for notifying a status of a first information processing apparatus and a second information processing apparatus which has a reproducing unit for reproducing information, the first and second information processing apparatuses being interconnected for mutually transmitting/receiving the information, the status notification apparatus comprising:

an inquiry device equipped in the first information processing apparatus and making an inquiry about whether or not the second information processing apparatus has a function of transmitting/receiving the information and a control function of enabling the first information processing apparatus to utilize the information; and

a notification device equipped in the first information processing apparatus and starting the notification upon confirmation by the inquiry device that the second information processing apparatus has the function and the control function.

The Examiner maintains that Iwamura discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention. However, Iwamura discloses only a “topology map” and “connection map,” which are not more than a map of IDs. Iwamura’s “topology map” and “connection map” cannot exchange such functional information discussed on page 21 and Figures 3 and 8 of Iwamura. Therefore, Iwamura fails to teach or suggest “a control function of enabling the first information processing apparatus to utilize the information” as recited by claim 1.

Furthermore, Iwamura discloses in column 5, lines 45-56 that, “[r]eturning to FIG. 3, step 408, after the self identification process, a device identification process is performed. During this process 408, DSS IRD 100 sends commands to all the nodes and inquires as to their respective device types. Device type information may be stored in and returned from a

configuration ROM associated with each node of the serial bus as is known in the art. According to the responses from the nodes, DSS IRD 100 associates unique device names to the nodes automatically. For example, a DVCR will be named “DVCR”. If multiple DVCRs are connected, a suffix will be attached to each of the device names as follows: DVCR1, DVCR2, etc.” (emphasis added).

Therefore, in Iwamura’s production of the topology map, only ID and port number are used to produce the topology map. Iwamura thus does not teach or suggest a control function as claimed.

Additionally, Iwamura discloses on column 8, line 66 to column 9, line 12, that “FIG. 3 illustrates how device information may be retrieved using the connection map implementation of the present invention. If an INFO button 930 is selected from a pop-up menu 916 associated with DVCR2 icon 904, DSS IRD 100 transmits a command to DVCR2 112 to send information regarding the video tape being played. DVCR2 112 returns the tape information. The information will then appear in a window 918 on the screen as illustrated in FIG. 13. The contents of the information window 918 depends on the device selected and its features. Examples of device information include: time (tape/disk remaining time, total playback/recording time, etc.); title (name of the loaded tape or disk); (write protection (on or off); and play mode (long play or standard play).”

However, Iwamura’s tape information and device information do not correspond to or suggest the “control function” as recited by claim 1. Because Iwamura’s tape information and

device information are mere static information and are not dynamic function or control function as a kind of capability of receiving (audio) information, the claimed invention is therefore neither taught or suggested by Iwamura.

At least by virtue of the aforementioned differences, Applicants' claim 1 distinguishes over Iwamura. Applicants' claim 9 is a related independent method claim which recites similar elements, and is distinguished over Iwamura for analogous reasons. Applicants' claims 2, 5 and 7 are dependent claims including all of the elements of independent claim 1, which as established above, distinguishes over Iwamura. Therefore, claims 2, 5 and 7 are distinguished over Iwamura for at least the aforementioned reasons as well as for their additionally recited features. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are respectfully requested.

Newly Added Claims

Applicants have added new claims 19-21 to provide more varied scope of protection for the present invention. Claims 19-21 are allowable based on their dependencies as well as for their additionally recited features. That is, the cited references do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*: that "the information comprises audio information," as recited by claims 19-21.

Conclusion and request for telephone interview

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 10/666,561
Attorney Docket No. Q77600

Art Unit No. 2111

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

____/Lenny Jiang 52,432/____
Lenny R. Jiang
Registration No. 52,432

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 20, 2006